

MADRID PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

—————
JULY 24, 1997.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
the Union and ordered to be printed
—————

Mr. COBLE, from the Committee on the Judiciary,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 567]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 567) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Purpose and Summary	2
Background and Need for the Legislation	2
Hearings	4
Committee Consideration	4
Vote of the Committee	4
Committee Oversight Findings	4
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight Findings	4
New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures	4
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	5
Constitutional Authority Statement	6
Section-by-Section Analysis and Discussion	6
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	7

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of H.R. 567 is to implement the Madrid Protocol Agreement ("Protocol") which provides for an international registration system for trademarks.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Trademark protection under federal law provides for the legal protection of particular words or symbols that have been used on particular goods or services. Trademark protection generally entitles the owner of a trademark to protection against similar or confusing trademarks.

Trademarks constitute a significant part of the value of a product and figure largely in the advertising of the product. A very recognizable mark reflects the popularity of a product and often is prominently featured in a company's advertising. The protection of the mark is therefore of paramount importance to the affected company. Understandably, an individual or company using another company's mark could significantly diminish the market share of a particular product or compromise the goodwill derived from ownership of the mark.

Since products are marketed and sold on an international scale, protection in countries other than the United States improves the competitiveness of American businesses. Each country has its own laws determining the level of protection for trademarks and the type of marks that can be registered for particular products. American citizens seeking protection for their trademarks outside the United States are currently required to register individually in each country in which protection is sought.

As with many intellectual property rights, there are international agreements relating to the registration and protection of trademarks. Since 1891, the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks ("Madrid Agreement") has provided an international registration system operated under the auspices of the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). The United States has never been a signatory to the Madrid Agreement.

On June 27, 1989, at a Diplomatic Conference in Madrid, Spain, the parties to the Madrid Agreement signed the Madrid Protocol. The United States was an observer and advisor to these talks but not a participant in the negotiations since only signatories could amend the Madrid Agreement through the Protocol. Subsequent talks, at which the United States has participated as an observer, have been devoted to developing regulations for the implementation of the Protocol for those countries and entities which have and will become signatories to it. Practically speaking, the resulting Protocol amendments updated the Madrid Agreement, in many respects by conforming its contents to existing provisions in U.S. law.

H.R. 567 represents implementing legislation for the Protocol. It is identical to measures introduced in both the 103rd and 104th Congresses. While the Administration has still not forwarded the treaty to the Senate for ratification, thereby allowing the United States to become a member of the Protocol, the introduction of H.R. 567 sends a signal to the international community, U.S. businesses,

and trademark owners that Congress is serious about our nation becoming part of a low-cost, efficient system to promote the international registration of marks. U.S. membership in the Protocol would assist American businesses in protecting their proprietary names and brand-name goods while saving money, time, and effort. This is especially critical to small businesses which may otherwise lack the resources to acquire world-wide protection for their trademarks.

The Protocol took effect in April 1996, and currently binds 16 countries, but not the United States. Without U.S. participation, however, the Protocol may never achieve its purpose of providing a one-stop, inexpensive "shop" for trademark applicants who, by filing one application in their country and in their language, can receive protection from each member country of the Protocol.

There is no opposition to H.R. 567, nor to the substantive portions of the treaty. The State Department is trying to resolve differences between the Administration and the European Union (EU) regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol in the Assembly established by the agreement. Pursuant to the Protocol, the EU receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member states. While it may be argued that the existence of a supranational European trademark issued by the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market ("European Trademark Office") justifies the additional vote, the State Department opposes this proviso as a contravention of the democratic concept of one vote per country. State Department officials also believe this voting structure may establish a precedent for deviation from the one vote-one state principle in future international agreements. These differences must be settled before the Secretary of State will recommend to the President that the Administration sign the Protocol and present a ratification package to the Senate.

In furtherance of this end, the Secretary of State transmitted an April 1997 "demarche," or diplomatic representation, to European Commission (EC) officials in Brussels, Belgium, requesting that the organization assent to a compromise position on the Protocol voting rights structure mentioned above. In effect, the Secretary wants the EC (the government bureaucracy of the EU) to endorse substitute language on the matter that is identical to that set forth in Article 15.3(b) of the WIPO Copyright Treaty negotiated last December in Geneva, Switzerland. Briefly, Article 15.3(b) would permit an "intergovernmental organization," such as the EU, to participate *in place of its member states with a number of votes equal to the number of states which are parties to the Protocol*. Moreover, an intergovernmental organization could not vote if one of its member states chose to participate, and vice versa. In other words, the EU could function only as a proxy for its members.

While the focal point of the demarche is the voting rights structure of the Protocol, the Secretary of State also mentioned the following topics in the document:

The adoption of Article 18 WIPO Copyright language governing "competency" among the EU and its member states. This would ensure that every contracting party to the Protocol (including intergovernmental organizations like the EU) would

assume all of the obligations under the Protocol in addition to enjoying all of its benefits.

Affirmation of Article 14 of the Protocol governing the admission of "acceptable" intergovernmental organizations.

"Bloc," or en masse, voting. The State Department is concerned that the EU could cast bloc votes on behalf of its members, a practice that could "jeopardize" the value of single votes and potentially compromise U.S. interests. The demarche cites the need to explore the matter informally.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property conducted a hearing on H.R. 567 on May 22, 1997. Representatives from the State Department, the Patent and Trademark Office, the International Trademark Association (INTA), and the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) all testified in support of the bill.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On June 10, 1997, the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, a reporting quorum being present, ordered H.R. 567 reported by voice vote, with no objection heard, to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

Subsequently, the Committee on the Judiciary, a reporting quorum being present, ordered H.R. 567 reported on June 18, 1997, also by voice vote, with no objection heard.

VOTE OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no recorded votes during committee consideration of H.R. 567.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

In compliance with clause 2(1)(3)(A) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee reports that the findings and recommendations of the Committee, based on oversight activities under clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this report.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

No findings or recommendations of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight were received as referred to in clause 2(1)(3)(D) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND TAX EXPENDITURES

Clause 2(1)(3)(B) of House Rule XI is inapplicable because this legislation does not provide new budgetary authority or increased tax expenditures.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 2(1)(C)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee sets forth, with respect to the bill, H.R. 567, the following estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 1997.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 567, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Kristen Layman, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL, *Director.*

Enclosure.

H.R. 567—Madrid Protocol Implementation Act

H.R. 567 would amend the Trademark Act of 1946 in order to facilitate the implementation of the Madrid Protocol, an international agreement that provides for the possibility of obtaining trademark protection in several jurisdictions by a single registration. The bill specifies administrative procedures that would be followed by companies applying for international protection of trademarks.

CBO estimates that enacting this bill would have no significant effect on the federal budget. Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 excludes from application of that act legislative provisions that are necessary to implement international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that H.R. 567 fits within that exclusion because it would implement the Madrid Protocol.

Based on information from the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), CBO estimates that the PTO would incur costs of less than \$500,000 in fiscal year 1999 to establish a computer database, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

United States participation in the Madrid protocol is also likely to result in an increase in the number of trademark applications received by the PTO. The PTO's costs for processing trademark applications are fully funded by filing fees paid by the applicants. Such fees are collected and spent under authority provided in annual appropriations acts. Because fee income offsets the costs of processing applications, there would be no net budgetary impact from any change in the number of trademark applications.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Kristen Layman, who can be reached at 226-2880. The estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(1)(4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, section 8, clause 8, of the Constitution.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1.—Short Title

This section provides a short title: the “Madrid Protocol Implementation Act.”

Section 2.—Amendments to the Trademark Act of 1946

This section amends the “Trademark Act of 1946” by adding a new Title XII which contains the following provisions:

The owner of a registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) or the owner of a pending application before the PTO may file an international application for trademark protection at the PTO.

After receipt of the appropriate fee and inspection of the application, the PTO Commissioner is charged with the duty of transmitting the application to the WIPO International Bureau.

The Commissioner is also obliged to notify the International Bureau whenever the international application has been “. . . restricted, abandoned, canceled, or has expired . . .” within a specified time period.

The holder of an international registration may request an extension of its registration by filing with the PTO or the International Bureau.

The holder of an international registration is entitled to the benefits of extension in the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Protocol; however, an extension of an international registration shall not apply to the United States if the PTO is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection in the United States may claim a date of priority based on certain conditions.

If the PTO Commissioner believes that an applicant is entitled to an extension of protection, he or she publishes the mark in the “Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.” This serves notice to third parties who oppose the extension. Unless an official protest conducted pursuant to existing law is successful, the request for extension may not be refused. If the request for extension is denied, however, the Commissioner notifies the International Bureau of such action and sets forth the reason(s) why. The Commissioner must also apprise the International Bureau of other relevant information pertaining to requests for extension within designated time periods.

If an extension for protection is granted, the Commissioner issues a certificate attesting to such action, and publishes notice of the certificate in the “Gazette.” Holders of extension certificates thereafter enjoy protection equal to that of other owners of registration listed on the Principal Register of the PTO.

If the International Bureau notifies the PTO of a cancellation of some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Commissioner must cancel an extension of protection with respect to the same goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled. Similarly, if the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection in the United States shall cease to be valid. Finally, the holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau may file an application for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration.

The holder of an extension of protection must, within designated time periods and under certain conditions, file an affidavit setting forth the relevant goods or services covered and any explanation as to why their nonuse in commerce is related to "special circumstances," along with a filing fee.

The right to an extension of protection may be assigned to a third party so long as that individual is a national of, or is domiciled in, or has a "bonafide" business located in a country that is a member of the Protocol; or has such a business in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization (like the EC) belonging to the Protocol.

An extension of protection conveys the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark if the extension and existing registration are owned by the same person, and extension of protection and the existing registration cover the same goods or services, and the certificate of extension is issued after the date of the existing registration.

Section 3.—Effective Date

This section states that the effective date of the act shall commence on the date on which the Madrid Protocol takes effect in the United States.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

ACT OF JULY 5, 1946

(Commonly referred to as the "Trademark Act of 1946")

AN ACT To provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

* * * * *

TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) *MADRID PROTOCOL*.—The term “Madrid Protocol” means the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, adopted at Madrid, Spain, on June 27, 1989.

(2) *BASIC APPLICATION*.—The term “basic application” means the application for the registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

(3) *BASIC REGISTRATION*.—The term “basic registration” means the registration of a mark that has been granted by an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

(4) *CONTRACTING PARTY*.—The term “Contracting Party” means any country or inter-governmental organization that is a party to the Madrid Protocol.

(5) *DATE OF RECORDAL*.—The term “date of recordal” means the date on which a request for extension of protection that is filed after an international registration is granted is recorded on the International Register.

(6) *DECLARATION OF BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE THE MARK IN COMMERCE*.—The term “declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce” means a declaration that is signed by the applicant for, or holder of, an international registration who is seeking extension of protection of a mark to the United States and that contains a statement that—

(A) the applicant or holder has a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce,

(B) the person making the declaration believes himself or herself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he or she makes the declaration, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce, and

(C) no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form of the mark or in such near resemblance to the mark as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, firm, corporation, or association, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

(7) *EXTENSION OF PROTECTION*.—The term “extension of protection” means the protection resulting from an international registration that extends to a Contracting Party at the request of the holder of the international registration, in accordance with the Madrid Protocol.

(8) *HOLDER OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION*.—A “holder” of an international registration is the natural or juristic person in whose name the international registration is recorded on the International Register.

(9) *INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.*—The term “international application” means an application for international registration that is filed under the Madrid Protocol.

(10) *INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.*—The term “International Bureau” means the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

(11) *INTERNATIONAL REGISTER.*—The term “International Register” means the official collection of such data concerning international registrations maintained by the International Bureau that the Madrid Protocol or its implementing regulations require or permit to be recorded, regardless of the medium which contains such data.

(12) *INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.*—The term “international registration” means the registration of a mark granted under the Madrid Protocol.

(13) *INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DATE.*—The term “international registration date” means the date assigned to the international registration by the International Bureau.

(14) *NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.*—The term “notification of refusal” means the notice sent by an Office of a Contracting Party to the International Bureau declaring that an extension of protection cannot be granted.

(15) *OFFICE OF A CONTRACTING PARTY.*—The term “Office of a Contracting Party” means—

(A) the office, or governmental entity, of a Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks, or

(B) the common office, or governmental entity, of more than 1 Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks and is so recognized by the International Bureau.

(16) *OFFICE OF ORIGIN.*—The term “office of origin” means the Office of a Contracting Party with which a basic application was filed or by which a basic registration was granted.

(17) *OPPOSITION PERIOD.*—The term “opposition period” means the time allowed for filing an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, including any extension of time granted under section 13.

SEC. 61. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS BASED ON UNITED STATES APPLICATIONS OR REGISTRATIONS.

The owner of a basic application pending before the Patent and Trademark Office, or the owner of a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office, who—

(1) is a national of the United States,

(2) is domiciled in the United States, or

(3) has a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the United States,

may file an international application by submitting to the Patent and Trademark Office a written application in such form, together with such fees, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

Upon the filing of an application for international registration and payment of the prescribed fees, the Commissioner shall examine the international application for the purpose of certifying that the

information contained in the international application corresponds to the information contained in the basic application or basic registration at the time of the certification. Upon examination and certification of the international application, the Commissioner shall transmit the international application to the International Bureau.

SEC. 63. RESTRICTION, ABANDONMENT, CANCELLATION, OR EXPIRATION OF A BASIC APPLICATION OR BASIC REGISTRATION.

With respect to an international application transmitted to the International Bureau under section 62, the Commissioner shall notify the International Bureau whenever the basic application or basic registration which is the basis for the international application has been restricted, abandoned, or canceled, or has expired, with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration—

- (1) within 5 years after the international registration date;
- or
- (2) more than 5 years after the international registration date if the restriction, abandonment, or cancellation of the basic application or basic registration resulted from an action that began before the end of that 5-year period.

SEC. 64. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION SUBSEQUENT TO INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

The holder of an international registration that is based upon a basic application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office or a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office may request an extension of protection of its international registration by filing such a request—

- (1) directly with the International Bureau, or
- (2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau, if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

SEC. 65. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MADRID PROTOCOL.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to the provisions of section 68, the holder of an international registration shall be entitled to the benefits of extension of protection of that international registration to the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Madrid Protocol.

(b) *IF UNITED STATES IS OFFICE OF ORIGIN.*—An extension of protection resulting from an international registration of a mark shall not apply to the United States if the Patent and Trademark Office is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

SEC. 66. EFFECT OF FILING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) *REQUIREMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.*—A request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States that the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office shall be deemed to be properly filed in the United States if such request, when received by the International Bureau, has attached to it a declaration of bona

fide intention to use the mark in commerce that is verified by the applicant for, or holder of, the international registration.

(b) EFFECT OF PROPER FILING.—Unless extension of protection is refused under section 68, the proper filing of the request for extension of protection under subsection (a) shall constitute constructive use of the mark, conferring the same rights as those specified in section 7(c), as of the earliest of the following:

(1) The international registration date, if the request for extension of protection was filed in the international application.

(2) The date of recordal of the request for extension of protection, if the request for extension of protection was made after the international registration date.

(3) The date of priority claimed pursuant to section 67.

SEC. 67. RIGHT OF PRIORITY FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES.

The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States shall be entitled to claim a date of priority based on the right of priority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property if—

(1) the international registration contained a claim of such priority; and

(2)(A) the international application contained a request for extension of protection to the United States, or

(B) the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection to the United States is not later than 6 months after the date of the first regular national filing (within the meaning of Article 4(A)(3) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) or a subsequent application (within the meaning of Article 4(C)(4) of the Paris Convention).

SEC. 68. EXAMINATION OF AND OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION; NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.

(a) EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this title, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), a request for extension of protection under this title shall be subject to opposition under section 13. Unless successfully opposed, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused.

(3) Extension of protection shall not be refused under this section on the ground that the mark has not been used in commerce.

(4) Extension of protection shall be refused under this section to any mark not registrable on the Principal Register.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—If, a request for extension of protection is refused under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall declare in a notification of refusal (as provided in subsection (c)) that the extension of protection cannot be granted, together with a statement of all grounds on which the refusal was based.

(c) NOTICE TO INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—(1) Within 18 months after the date on which the International Bureau transmits to the

Patent and Trademark Office a notification of a request for extension of protection, the Commissioner shall transmit to the International Bureau any of the following that applies to such request:

(A) A notification of refusal based on an examination of the request for extension of protection.

(B) A notification of refusal based on the filing of an opposition to the request.

(C) A notification of the possibility that an opposition to the request may be filed after the end of that 18-month period.

(2) If the Commissioner has sent a notification of the possibility of opposition under paragraph (1)(C), the Commissioner shall, if applicable, transmit to the International Bureau a notification of refusal on the basis of the opposition, together with a statement of all the grounds for the opposition, within 7 months after the beginning of the opposition period or within 1 month after the end of the opposition period, whichever is earlier.

(3) If a notification of refusal of a request for extension of protection is transmitted under paragraph (1) or (2), no grounds for refusal of such request other than those set forth in such notification may be transmitted to the International Bureau by the Commissioner after the expiration of the time periods set forth in paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

(4) If a notification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) is not sent to the International Bureau within the time period set forth in such paragraph, with respect to a request for extension of protection, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused and the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request.

(d) **DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In responding to a notification of refusal with respect to a mark, the holder of the international registration of the mark shall designate, by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, the name and address of a person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person, or mailing to that person, a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

(a) **ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.**—Unless a request for extension of protection is refused under section 68, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

(b) **EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.**—From the date on which a certificate of extension of protection is issued under subsection (a)—

(1) such extension of protection shall have the same effect and validity as a registration on the Principal Register, and

(2) *the holder of the international registration shall have the same rights and remedies as the owner of a registration on the Principal Register.*

SEC. 70. DEPENDENCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNDERLYING INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

(a) **EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.**—*If the International Bureau notifies the Patent and Trademark Office of the cancellation of an international registration with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Commissioner shall cancel any extension of protection to the United States with respect to such goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled.*

(b) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RENEW INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.**—*If the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection to the United States shall cease to be valid as of the date of the expiration of the international registration.*

(c) **TRANSFORMATION OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION INTO A UNITED STATES APPLICATION.**—*The holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau at the request of the office of origin, under Article 6(4) of the Madrid Protocol, may file an application, under section 1 or 44 of this Act, for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration. Such an application shall be treated as if it had been filed on the international registration date or the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection with the International Bureau, whichever date applies, and, if the extension of protection enjoyed priority under section 67 of this title, shall enjoy the same priority. Such an application shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by this subsection only if the application is filed not later than 3 months after the date on which the international registration was canceled, in whole or in part, and only if the application complies with all the requirements of this Act which apply to any application filed pursuant to section 1 or 44.*

SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

(a) **REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.**—*An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner—*

(1) *at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, unless within the 1-year period preceding the expiration of that 6-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; and*

(2) *at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by*

the Commissioner, and at the end of each 10-year period thereafter, unless—

(A) within the 6-month period preceding the expiration of such 10-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; or

(B) within 3 months after the expiration of such 10-year period, the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with the fee described in subparagraph (A) and an additional fee prescribed by the Commissioner.

(b) **CONTENTS OF AFFIDAVIT.**—The affidavit referred to in subsection (a) shall set forth those goods or services recited in the extension of protection on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and the holder of the international registration shall attach to the affidavit a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or shall set forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of extension of protection.

SEC. 72. ASSIGNMENT OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

An extension of protection may be assigned, together with the goodwill associated with the mark, only to a person who is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment either in a country that is a Contracting Party or in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party.

SEC. 73. INCONTESTABILITY.

The period of continuous use prescribed under section 15 for a mark covered by an extension of protection issued under this title may begin no earlier than the date on which the Commissioner issues the certificate of the extension of protection under section 69, except as provided in section 74.

SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

An extension of protection shall convey the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark, if—

(1) the extension of protection and the existing registration are owned by the same person;

(2) the goods and services listed in the existing registration are also listed in the extension of protection; and

(3) the certificate of extension of protection is issued after the date of the existing registration.